

FIRST REGIONAL WORKSHOP

Strengthening Research and Policy-making Capacity on Trade and Environment in Developing Countries

November 11-13, 1999
Los Baños, Province of Laguna
Philippines

I. Introduction

The project was deemed important because there is a need for strategic action for responding to trade and environment challenges both at national and international levels. Even as environmental degradation has increased, developing countries have responded to challenges as evidenced by Global action on Agenda 21. Individually also countries have responded through synergistic multi-stakeholder partnerships and through the constitution of national Councils for implementing Agenda 21. The complex and inter-disciplinary nature of many trade and environment problems both at national and international level and the multitude of international agreements and fora dealing with trade and environment issues required enhanced policy co-ordination at national level and continuous analysis for informed decision-making. The effort at this workshop was to learn from each other's experience, and to strengthen efforts to collectively face common global environmental problems.

An integral part of the conceptual work was also to outreach to other players and especially involve academia and the civil society. This is why, the project includes budget lines to involve experts from academia in the group of countries selected for the project. Participants were urged to identify some issues, on which they would like experts to provide papers.

II. Salient Issues

A. Technology Transfer

Main issues

Tanzania and the Philippines chaired this session. UNCTAD presented a general paper analyzing the effective operationalization of the provisions on transfer of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries in MEAs, pursuant to Agenda 21.

The paper argued that while several MEAs had provisions on transfer of technology the experience with technology transfer had been rather disappointing for developing countries. This was because transfer of technology was not just a technical issue but should be part of social-economic/development priorities of the countries. It was underlined that the markets for technologies were affected by four factors which may in turn affect the dissemination of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs):

- escalating R&D costs and shorter lifespan of products;
- enterprise behaviour - mergers and acquisition, to accommodate higher R&D costs;
- use of IPRs to expand markets - new role of TRIPs agreement in IPRs;
- liberalisation of import regimes in developing countries implies that large firms would rather sell their products than technologies.

In general, the paper highlighted that the provisions on transfer of ESTs in MEAs had neither affected nor in any manner influenced the prevailing contractual terms and conditions for transfer of technology (ToT) in open technology markets. MEA provisions had rather circumvented the highly controversial issues by establishing funding mechanisms through which certain ESTs could be obtained on a commercial basis against grants from funding mechanisms of MEAs. The added value of ToT regimes in MEAs in the evolution of the norms and principles relating to international technology transfer was therefore marginal. Their main thrust lay in the interaction between financial and technology transfer mechanisms.

A coarse survey of the provisions on transfer of ESTs in the MEAs revealed that there were agreements with very specific and elaborate provisions, and others with rather general and tenuous ones. The latter concerns the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions, whereas the former concerns the UNFCCC, the Montreal Protocol and the CBD. With probably the exception of CBD, the specificity of the provisions on ToT seemed to be closely linked to the political interest of developed countries in the MEAs. It was obvious that in certain MEAs, developed countries were seeking collaboration and concessions from developing countries to address global environmental problems, which had significantly been caused by environmentally unsustainable practices in developed countries. That

constellation had strengthened the bargaining position of developing countries and given them an opportunity to push through specific demands in the area of transfer of ESTs. In fact, strict reciprocity was built into the UNFCCC, Montreal Protocol and CBD, making the implementation of agreed obligations by developing countries dependent upon the effective implementation by developed countries of the financial co-operation and transfer of technology provisions (Art. 5.5. of MP; Art. 20.4. of CBD; and Art. 4.7. of UNFCCC).

The CBD appeared to be an agreement, in which both developed and developing countries had a common and strong interest. Despite the built-in reciprocity, the provisions on ToT related to assisting in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (Art. 16.1. and 16.2.) were weaker than those linked to the use of genetic resources in developing countries (Art. 16.3.). Several observers attributed that to the fact that developed country parties were interested not only in the conservation of bio-diversity, but also in utilizing the biological resources in developing countries.

Conversely, the provisions on ToT in the Basel Convention and the Rotterdam Convention were very general and did not contain any reciprocity.

Country Experience - the case of India

Results of empirical studies from 64 companies in India with respect to the Montreal Protocol, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) show that if technology is embodied in capital equipment, transfer of technology can take place through Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). However, if technology is not easily copiable, eg. systems technology, the right approach may be to put in mechanisms for technology development funds within MEAs. If the technology is easily copiable, then IPRs are a barrier. A large number of technologies are in public domain, but cannot be operationalised because of lack of knowledge about them, and their unsuitability for developing countries . Public/private partnerships may be useful in these cases perhaps in the context of GEF.

Country experience – the case of Tanzania

It was highlighted that Tanzania had a large subsistence economy with a weak industrial and technological base. Before 1990, transfer of technology was mainly conducted through ODA, based on some 40 donors. However, there was no co-ordination and overall strategy, and the linkages between training institutions and private firms were not significant

Tanzania was constrained by economic, social, cultural and legal factors in technology transfer. Pollution control had not evolved as part and parcel of industrialisation in Tanzania. Inability to make proper choices in the acquisition of technology, lack of investment capacity for acquisition of technology, and donor-driven technology supplies were other important constraints to technology transfer in Tanzania.

To address the above problems, institutions for co-ordination of technology such as CDTT were created. The Centre for Cleaner Production at TIRDO was also created to assess and monitor environmentally sound technologies. A national Ozone Office under the Vice President's Office had been formed for the implementation of Montreal Protocol. This along with the Refrigeration Management Plan to substitute ODS with environmentally friendly technologies were just some examples of incentives provided by the Government of Tanzania to promote the absorption of technologies. The Government had also taken steps to support technology transfer through the establishment of a venture capital fund.

Summary of discussions

The discussions highlighted several interesting questions, such as the importance of costs and benefits of accessing and changing to various environmentally sound technologies, Clearly, benefits should outweigh costs.

Cuba referred to measures to improve technology transfer through improvements in investment and tax infrastructure for promoting transfer of environmentally sound technologies. For example, in the refrigeration industry, new technologies from Italy improved Cuba's competitiveness in the Caribbean region. However, several

countries pointed out that environmental research was affected by economic problems. Governments were unsure on which industry to invest in and had problems in addressing the pressing problems facing them.

It was also pointed out by several countries that phase out of ODS in sectors such as aerosols was related to availability and affordability both of equipment and technologies. Under multilateral financing arrangements, it was possible to get that kind of equipment.

Several countries had provided institutional frameworks for environmentally sound technologies. Tunisia highlighted that the country had classified R& D activities into three different categories of ESTs, blue for coastal areas, green for maintaining forests, and yellow for combatting desertification.

WTO issues related to transfer of technologies

In the Survey of WTO agreements the following articles were identified as being related to technology transfer:

TRIPs

Art.7	transfer of technology should be ensured
Art. 8	rules which allow socio-economic diversity, restrictive business practices also to be tackled
Art 40	check abuses of IPRs
Art 66.2	transfer of technology incentives to be provided by developed countries
Art 67	technical co-operation between developing and developed countries

TBT

Art 11	technical assistance - including technological assistance - sought by LDCs
--------	--

SPS

Art 9	technical assistance provisions
-------	---------------------------------

In view of these provisions a Proposal for a working group on transfer of technology with the following mandate has been mooted:

- Identify problems faced by developing countries in accessing transfer of technology.
- All agreements which promote access on fair and favourable terms should be promoted.
- Dual use technologies should be promoted.
- Transfer of technology should be factored in as important issue for developing countries in all future negotiations on MEAs or other international environmental agreements.
- Institutional capabilities for promoting the transfer of technology, e.g. data base, legal and administrative framework, financing mechanisms, research capacities should be built into such agreements.
- Suggestion of specific support measures to facilitate transfer of technology from developed to developing countries, such as
 - cooperation with scientific institutions;
 - concessional and other financing for companies;
 - commercialisation of local innovations.
- Study the design of incentives, including tax incentives, for facilitating access to and transfer of technology.

B. Domestically Prohibited Goods

Several examples of DPGs imported into countries were cited. It was also pointed out that some DPGs may serve other functions such as health and food security. The case of DDT was referred to as an example of a product deemed useful for malaria. Several examples of DPGs were provided by Bangladesh. Hazardous waste, for instance, was often imported under the guise of consumer products, such as fertilisers or food items. The example of the import of "vetch" as a lentil when it was not even deemed fit for animal feed in Australia was also cited. However, it was felt that the Government of Bangladesh had no capacity to deal with the disguises used by firms to

export DPGs. Uganda pointed out that carrier bags, used clothing etc were also DPGs which were causing problems to the domestic environment and economy.

Costa Rica pointed out that it had successfully dealt with DPGs which was a large problem about ten years ago. The country had enacted regulations for handling, management and use of dangerous products, which covered biodiversity, water, heavy metals (in particular mercury), explosives etc. There were several provisions that prohibit the import, export and use of certain dangerous products or that regulate the adequate management of certain products, for which import and export is prohibited or restricted. For example, recently the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Agriculture and Cattle enacted several decrees to update the list of products that was subject to trade and use restrictions in Costa Rica. There were also a number of laws that prevented harm to the environment such as the Law of Water, the Law of Conservation of Wildlife, the Ruling on Pesticides, the Ruling on waste management, the General Law on Health, etc. So far, however, the Ministry of Environment had not enacted specific provisions on DPGs in Costa Rica.

Brazil also pointed out that regulations helped to control the import of DPGs. Brazil had ratified the Basel Convention and had domestically implemented its provisions. The National Environment Council of Brazil had recently enacted a resolution to control the disposal of battery waste. According to that resolution, the producers and importers of used lead batteries had to provide infrastructure for the environmentally sound disposal of such waste. All irresponsible disposal of battery waste was considered an environmental crime, and thus subject to legal penalty.

Several countries felt that import bans would not be enough to control trade in DPGs. It was necessary to regulate handling, management and use of DPGs. But to do that, it may be necessary to draw up an indicative list of DPGs. Also developing countries need help in regulating domestically produced wastes.

C. Market Access

India presented a generic paper on the impact of environmental requirements on export performance. The paper argued that the main issues, which need further clarification, are the relationship between WTO rules and PPMs as well as MEAs and the use of the Precautionary Principle.

The paper identified a number of environmental requirements in export markets, which are of particular importance. This concerns product-related requirements; conformity assessment requirements; PPM-related requirements on, for instance, eco-labeling, recycling content, take-back obligations; MEA-related requirements and other voluntary mechanisms. In the case of India, product-related standards, PPMs and conformity assessment procedures were the most important issue.

The paper contained a number of proposals on ways forward to enhance market access. Information gathering and transparency in standard setting were of particular importance. The same applied to transfer of technology and capacity-building. There should also be an effort of further improving infrastructure. Developing countries should also enhance their participation in international standard setting and strive for more mutual recognition of their eco-labels and standards.

Bangladesh gave an overview of salient market access issues on its shrimp export and specific cases of temporary import bans into specific developed country markets. Uganda summarized the main findings of its country study on environmental implications of liberalizing trade in agricultural and fish products.

Summary of the discussion

It was highlighted that developing countries should make greater use of existing national eco-labeling schemes. It was also necessary to enhance the mutual recognition of such schemes with developed countries. Process-related requirements were considered to be not necessarily relevant for product quality.

However, some process/production requirements were necessary where they were related to critical product quality characteristics. Generally, there was a lack of awareness, skills, equipment and training in addressing market access issues. There was also the need to rationalize national rule-making in developing countries.

D. Sui generis systems for the protection of plant varieties

Presentation on sui generis systems were made by Cuba, Brazil, Costa Rica, India, Philippines and South Africa. Most systems appear to be modelled on UPOV 1978 principles, but appear to balance public interest in the protection of bio-diversity with commercial interests. The role of the state was considered important by all countries. It was also felt that multi-stakeholder consultative approaches were the most effective mechanism for devising sui generis systems. It was also mentioned that commercialization of traditional knowledge by TNCs or individual companies should be carefully examined. Gradual application on a case by case basis and providing adequate protection to farmers, rather than monopoly rights to breeders was deemed important.

Access issues

Sovereign rights of nation states to bio-diversity was acknowledged by all as the most important tenet of their sui generis protection systems. Specifically, Cuba referred to ex-situ and in-situ conservation through permits and access contracts. Cuban systems also exclude human genetic resources from patentability and guarantee fair and equitable sharing of benefits.

Costa Rica's law on bio-diversity recognizes the rights of traditional and indigenous knowledge. According to Article 2 of the Law on Bio-diversity, the State has a total and exclusive sovereignty over the elements of bio-diversity.

Brazil suggested that being a large repository of the planet's bio-diversity, it had substantial interest – both commercial and environmental - in protecting it. Draft law 4751/98, which has yet to be approved by the National Congress, provides for a regulation on access to bio-diversity resources and ensures equitable and fair sharing of resources. Brazil favours the enactment of national legislation to domestically implement, in a concrete way, the provisions of the CBD.

The Philippines also acknowledges that the natural rights for bio-diversity belongs to the state; however this is cited in the constitution as a sovereign right, where co-ownership with local communities (indigenous and cultural communities) was recognised recently. According to the Philippine constitution, the utilisation of biodiversity by interested parties such as planters, loggers etc should respect

- a) ancestral domain claims, which include rights over natural resources of indigenous communities for 25 years. This includes the exclusive use of species therein and the associated traditional knowledge.
- b) bio-prospecting law, where access to genetic resources would be denied without prior informed consent.

Protection of traditional knowledge of indigenous communities:

It was generally acknowledged that the definition of traditional knowledge and indigenous communities would be difficult. The Cuban system provides for the protection of the rights of indigenous communities and farmers' rights. The Brazilian draft law 4751/98 encompasses provisions guaranteeing the development of traditional knowledge with the participation and approval of indigenous communities that hold this knowledge and to ensure that these groups take part in benefit-sharing.

According to Brazil, it was also important to launch multilateral negotiations to ensure that the origin of traditional knowledge and genetic resources was identified when registering patents. The identification

of the source of the biological resource was of paramount importance for allowing real benefit sharing, according to CBD. Brazil's Ministry of Development estimated that research and development of new biochemical products until patented would require a period that ranged from 5 to 10 years and involved costs of about 250 to 500 million dollars. It was estimated that access to traditional knowledge could reduce these costs by 50%.

Costa Rica protects and legally recognizes the rights of the local communities to traditional knowledge. Farmers and indigenous communities will be involved by the Government in the process of determining the nature, scope and requirements of the sui generis communal intellectual property rights. Through this participatory process, the use and ownership of these sui generis communal rights should also be determined. India also is in the process of documenting traditional knowledge in some provinces.

The Philippines recognizes the right of local communities as a constitutional right as well as by establishing benefit-sharing schemes, which include the sharing of royalties, fees and benefits of research. Problems were acknowledged in the global discussion on traditional knowledge about the definition of indigenous communities and right-holders of knowledge. The problem of definition arose because the span of traditional knowledge includes several areas such as medicine, art, folklore and dance. All these are governed by very different systems of IP protection.

It was also found to be very difficult to document traditional knowledge as such, because knowledge is normally passed on to the next generation orally. Many suggested that documenting it would change the nature of traditional knowledge as well as its dynamic aspects. However, it was also considered necessary to protect it or it would be lost to mankind through the passing away of the older generation.

The systems established for the protection of traditional knowledge do not normally include patents, as traditional knowledge may not satisfy the criteria related to novelty. It was also considered difficult to integrate traditional communities into patent protection systems.

Benefit-sharing

Fair and equitable benefit-sharing was deemed important by most participants. Regulations on access was considered an important part of the development of schemes on benefit-sharing. South Africa highlighted that partnerships between companies and institutions should be seen in the context, in which such schemes had been formed. Their partnerships have been established according to the following norms:

- mutually agreed terms;
- vary between parties and between countries;
- take monetary and non-monetary forms;
- goal of providing incentives for the preservation of bio-diversity;
- indigenous knowledge and scientifically generated knowledge blended together.

Three examples were cited of agreements between firms in developed countries and research institutes in South Africa. However, generalizations and lessons for the involvement of local communities were difficult to draw as these examples involved the academia and were very case specific.

While specific examples were not cited by Tanzania on benefit-sharing, the country's legislation has developed several safeguards for benefit-sharing by the granting of appropriate user rights, developing a wildlife policy and a range of incentives and disincentives for conservation. It was felt important to consider the supply and demand factors that impact on the protection of bio-diversity. Extensive consultative processes had been affected to draw up some of the schemes.

India suggested that one of the mechanism of benefit-sharing could be that patent applicants must be obliged to (a) indicate geographic origin of the species used; and (b) obtain prior informed consent from the source country so that benefit-sharing mechanisms could be set up under domestic laws. This could include information- and material-sharing agreements.

The Philippines cited a number of benefit-sharing provisions in Executive Order 247. They provided for both monetary and non-monetary forms of benefit-sharing such as the payment of long term royalties, grants and scholarships to fund local research, transfer of equipment and research facility development by foreign companies, technology transfer, including the mandatory transfer of incubation facilities.

Costa Rica cited the well-known case of NBIO-Merck collaboration, according to which the country would grant unlimited access to its bio-diversity in return for scientific training, monetary benefits, technology transfer, etc. It was felt that since this was the longest-standing agreement of its kind, it would be interesting to analyze the pros and cons of this agreement. Second, it would also be interesting to analyze what proportion of the total species given to Merck had actually been commercialized.

TRIPS Article 27.3 (b) Review

Doubts were raised about the nature and the scope of the review. Three categories of issues were identified

- extension of the time period,
- exclusion from patentability of micro-organisms and microbiological processes,
- protection of plant varieties by patents or sui generis systems.

Many felt that the time period should be extended and micro-organisms and microbiological processes should be excluded from patentability. The difficulty with sui generis systems is that it is problematic to harmonize as well as to compare their relative effectiveness. It was also felt that different sui generis systems would be required for farmers, indigenous communities and for local varieties. It was also considered necessary to distinguish between commercial exploitation and production for traditional farming, including cultivation of new varieties. It was therefore suggested that the scope and level of patentability of micro-organisms and the effectiveness of sui generis systems were best decided at national level.

Criticism of UPOV '91 included the following:

- full commercial control to breeders without exceptions of UPOV '78;
- no reciprocity as in UPOV '78;
- weakened rights of farmers.

By contrast, UPOV '78 permits

- free use of harvested seeds,
- exchange of seeds between farmers,
- lesser disciplines on essential varieties,
- commercial exploitation after certification,
- plant varieties subject to compulsory licences for public and non-commercial use.

Since the review of the Article is still not complete in the WTO, it would be useful to share experiences on patentability issues, the sui generis systems for plant varieties and benefit sharing schemes.

Labelling and the use of the precautionary principle in the Biosafety Protocol were also discussed. The Philippines presented its national laws and mechanisms for their administration.

E. Trade Liberalization and Environment

Citing the example of Ugandan fisheries' exports, it was stated that trade liberalization could have both positive and negative effects on the environment. However, one missing link in these discussions was a discussion on the impact of trade liberalization on effective market access for developing countries. It was felt that this should be factored into the discussions on this issue as it would have a significant impact on the environmental effects of

trade liberalization. It was also argued that trade liberalization was irreversible as its benefits went beyond the environment. However, there was need to calibrate the environmental effects of trade liberalization.

WTO Issues

The discussion on WTO issues highlighted the positive and negative aspects of mainstreaming environment in the WTO agreements. This issue was generally regarded with suspicion by the members who felt that it was difficult to guess at the motives behind "mainstreaming" environment through the WTO agreements. It was also felt that most countries present were not demanders of the issue and more pressing for them were issues such as trade related Intellectual Property Rights. It was felt that WTO issues needed more discussion and further sessions, including during lunchtime or evenings, could be devoted to it.

Environment-friendly products (EFPs)

While presentations revealed the scope of expanding trade in these products, it was felt that more information and work was required in this area.

III. Future Work

The final session suggested the following activities on the main items of the workshop in preparation for the next regional workshop in Cuba:

1. Transfer of technology

In the light of the discussion it was felt that each country should prepare a short survey of the experiences of firms in accessing technology and what proportion of research on environmentally sound technologies was publicly funded. This will help UNCTAD to suggest mechanisms for reform of MEA provisions, or WTO rules or assist participants to better access technologies among themselves.

In gathering national information and for drawing up an action plan, three clusters of issues should be borne in mind:

- design of future MEA provisions on technology transfer;
- implications for the WTO's TRIPs Agreement;
- capacity-building issues at the national and international level.

Country experiences through firm-level interviews should focus on the question whether IPRs and FDI in the context of ESTs:

- Promote innovation and sharing of knowledge?
- Restore social balance or concentrate it in the hands of MNCs?
- Really balance profits and precaution, e.g. Biosafety?
- Respect diverse systems of protection of knowledge?
- Empower people through technology spillovers?
- Make technology accessible to developing countries?

In this regard, it was agreed that the *Philippines* would collect country experiences from *Brazil, India, Costa Rica* and *Tunisia* and consolidate the empirical information into a paper.

Linkages between experiences of countries such as Tanzania and Cuba on capacity-building for ToT and the issues raised in the India paper could form the basis for developing a fuller paper on capacity-building needs in the context of technology transfer for the group. *Tanzania* agreed to collect evidence on country experiences on capacity-building for technology transfer from *Bangladesh* and *Uganda*.

2. Domestically prohibited goods

Following the discussion it was felt that a paper could be drawn up by *Bangladesh* reflecting experience of the *Philippines, Costa Rica, Uganda, Tanzania* and *Tunisia* and pointing to measures that may be needed to control trade in DPGs. Some questions that could be answered by the countries concerned:

- The provision of an illustrative list of DPGs, which the country does import.
- How many of these DPGs are covered, in some way or the other, by MEAs?
- What are the domestic regulations, which you have enacted for controlling imports of DPGs?
- What kind of information base should be developed to control trade in such DPGs?
- Given the lack of interest of WTO members to notify DPGs, what kind of information-sharing mechanism should be developed?
- What kind of South-South information sharing mechanism could help in this situation?
- Should such mechanism also cover illicit trade?
- How does the country balance the import of DPGs with other national priorities, such as health, food security and natural resource management?

3. Market access

It was felt that the *Indian paper* should be further elaborated on the basis of its current thrust and enriched by national experience of other interested countries. *All countries* agreed to provide inputs on constructive avenues of addressing market access issues, based on the following three strategies:

- WTO rules, which facilitate and hinder market access;
- capacity building on supply side issues;
- a combination of the two.

Information should be based on suitable product and sector examples. The contributing countries were also encouraged to provide information on some or all of the following issues:

- environmental requirements in export markets;
- cost of compliance, such as
 - infrastructural costs
 - conformity assessment costs
 - input costs, etc.
- products/sectors most affected;
- SME issues;
- PPM issues;
- precautionary principle;
- sound science/risks that non-fulfillment may create;
- compliance strategies found effective.

4. Bio-diversity issues

A. Sui generis systems for the protection of plant varieties and protection of traditional knowledge of indigenous communities

For comparing systems of protection of traditional knowledge, it was felt that papers on sui generis systems could consider some or all of the following aspects:

- definition of traditional knowledge;
- benefits from concessions or receipt of royalties and the channelling of such funds to the benefit of local communities;
- sustainable management of environment;
- rules on exploitation of such knowledge;
- identification of right-holders, such as leaders of nations, communities or public funds;
- differentiation between access rights for commercial or scientific purposes;
- data base, registers or other methods, to be made obligatory or optional;
- periodic renewal or permanent rights.

Brazil will consolidate national experiences from *Philippines, India, Costa Rica, Cuba, and South Africa*.

B. Benefit-sharing arrangements

It was felt that *South Africa* could consolidate case studies and the experiences of *the Philippines, Tanzania, Costa Rica* and *Brazil* in deriving mutual benefit sharing schemes. Such a consolidation should include a consideration of the following points:

- a) monetary and non-monetary mechanisms of benefit sharing,
- b) national law concerning benefit sharing,
- c) national registers on source materials,
- d) prior-informed consent procedures, and
- e) sanctions for violations.

C. Review of Article 27.3 (b) of the TRIPS Agreement

Further discussions could focus on the extension of the time period; the exclusion from patentability of micro-organisms and microbiological processes; and the protection of plant varieties by patents or sui generis systems.

5. Issues to be concluded at the next workshop

It was agreed to wind up the following subjects at the next workshop:

- DPGs;
- sui generis and benefit-sharing;
- technology transfer.

Overview of Papers
First Regional Workshop on Strengthening Research and Policy-Making Capacity
on Trade and Environment in Developing Countries
Los Baños, Philippines, 11-13 November 1999

Title of Draft Papers	Prepared by: Country/Organization	Filename
Draft Report of the Workshop		dfid-sum.doc
Trade and Environment: General Issues		
Issue Paper on Trade & Environment - The Philippines	Philippines	t&e-ph.doc
Transfer of Technology		
An Analysis of Effective Operationalization of Provisions on Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies to Developing Countries in Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Pursuant to Agenda 21	UNCTAD	tot-unct.doc
Technology Transfer Issues - The Philippines	Philippines	tt-ph-1.doc
Technology Transfer Issues Releative to Global Agenda 21 and Multilateral Environmental and Trade Agreements	Philippines	tt-ph-2.doc
Transfer of Technology	Tanzania	tot-tanz.doc
Technology Transfer Issues Relative to Global Agenda 21 and Multilateral Environmental and Trade Agreements	PHILIPPINES (DOST-PCARRD)	
Domestically Prohibited Goods		
Issues Paper on Trade in Domestically Prohibited Goods - The Philippines	Philippines	dpqs-ph.doc
Market Access		
The Impact of Environmental Requirements on Export Performance	India (Lead) Bangladesh, Brazil, Cuba, Philippines, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda	ma-ind-e.doc
Issues Paper on Market Acces to OECD Countries for Agricultural Products	Philippines	ma-aq-ph.doc
Bio-diversity: TRIPs and CBD		
The CBD / TRIPs Relationship	FIELD	cbd-trip.doc
Patenting Life? (A Primer on the TRIPs Review)	GRAIN, MASIPAG and TEBTEBBA Foundation PHILIPPINES	
Bio-diversity: Sui Generis Systems		
Cuban Experiences in the Development of a Sui Generis System for the Protection of Plant Varieties	Cuba	cuba-sui.doc
Bio-diversity: Sui Generis Systems for the Protection of Plant Varieties and Traditional Knowledge Associated with Genetic Resources in Brazil	BRAZIL	braz-sui.doc
Bio-diversity: Sui Generis and Benefit-Sharing	PHILIPPINES	
Bio-diversity: Benefit-sharing		
Bio-diversity and Benefit-Sharing: Experience of the Republic of South Africa	South Africa	rsa-bs.doc
Bio-diversity and Mutual Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources: Experience of Tanzania	Tanzania	tanz-bs.doc
Bio-safety and Other Bio-diversity Issues		
Biosafety: Experience of the Republic of South Africa	South Africa	rsa-bsaf.doc
Biosafety Protocols and Considerations in Technology Development and Transfer in the Philippines	PHILIPPINES	biosf-ph.doc
Bio-diversity: Sui , Bio-Technology and GMOs Labelling Issues	UNCTAD	bd-gmo.doc
Environmental Effects of Trade Liberalization		
Environmental Implication of Liberalizing Trade In Agricultural and Fish Products - The Case for Uganda	Uganda	ugan-trl.doc
Multilateral Trading Rules' Issues		
The Compatibility of Recent MEAs with the WTO Rules	FIELD	mea-wto.doc
Judicial Activism and the Shrimp Turtle Case	UNCTAD	dsu-ja.doc
Mainstreaming Environment in the WTO: Possible Implications for Developing Countries	UNCTAD	mainstr.doc

AGENDA

Thursday, November 11:

- 0830 Registration
- 0900 Invocation
- 0915 Welcome Remarks and Opening Address
- 1000 Introductory Observations by UNCTAD secretariat and FIELD
- 1045 Technology Transfer Issues: Agenda 21 / MEA's / WTO
Co-Chairs: Tanzania/Philippines
- 1300 Lunch
- 1430 Technology Transfer Issues, cont'd
- 1630 Domestically Prohibited Goods
Chair: Philippines
- 1900 Reception offered by the Government of the Philippines

Friday, November 12:

- 0900 Market Access
Chair: India
- 1200 Working Lunch: Informal Briefing on Preparations for the Seattle Ministerial Conference
- 1400 Bio diversity: *sui generis* and benefit sharing
Chair: Brazil
- 1900 Dinner

Saturday, November 13:

- 0900 Progress on Other Issues (Environmentally Preferable Products, Trade Liberalization, Environmental Services, Sectoral Studies)
Wrap up and Next Steps
- 1200 Lunch
- 1400 Selected Issues on the International Agenda, Including a Discussion of Issues Papers
Prepared by UNCTAD and FIELD
- 1600 Closing session

List of Participants

A. Countries

Bangladesh

Mr. Md. Fazlul Huq
Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce
Government of Bangladesh
Bangladesh Secretariat
Room no.118, Building No. 3, Dhaka-1000,Bangladesh
Fax: (8802) 861-5741
Tel: (8802) 861-9648
e-mail: mincom@bdonline.com

Mr. Mosharraf Hossain
Joint Secretary (Dev.), Ministry of Environment and Forests
Government of Bangladesh
Dhaka-1000 Bangladesh
Fax: (8802) 8619210
Tel: (8802) 8617240
e-mail: moefgob@bttb.net

Brazil

Mr. Breno Hermann
Trade Policy Division, Ministry of Foreign Relations
Brasilia, Brazil
Fax: (5561) 411 6555
Tel: (5561) 411 6411/12
e-mail: bhermann@mre.gov.br

Ms. Maria Rita Silva Fontes Faria
Environment Division, Ministry of Foreign Relations
Brasilia, Brazil
Fax: (5561) 322 5523
Tel: (5561) 411 6985
e-mail: mfontes@mre.gov.br

Costa Rica

Mr. Ivan Vicenti Rojas
Ministry of Environment and Energy, San José, Costa Rica
Fax: (506) 253 69 84
Tel: (506) 224 4092 / 235 6515
e-mail: ivincen@casapres.go.cr

Ms. Laura Dachner
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of Costa Rica to the WTO, Geneva
Fax: (4122) 715 0099
Tel: (4122) 715 0090
e-mail: laura.dachner@ties.itu.int

Cuba

Ms. Belsis Llorente
International Organisation Division, Ministry of Foreign Trade
La Habana, Cuba
Fax: (537) 333389/550355
Tel: (537) 55 04 52 , 54 22 07
e-mail: doimail@infocecx.cu, rmuniz@infocecx.cu

Mr. Raul Jorge Garrido Vazquez
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnologia y Medio Ambiente

Direccion de Politica Ambiental
La Habana Cuba
Fax: (537) 570600
Tel: (537) 570598, 570615
e-mail: dpa@ceniai.inf.cu

India

Mr. Atul Kaushik
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Commerce, New Delhi, India
Fax: (91 11) 3013583
Tel: (91 11) 301 5888
e-mail: akaushik@ub.delhi.nic.in

Dr. Rashid Hasan
Joint Director
Ministry of Environment and Forests,
CGO Complex, Lodi Rd., New Delhi, India
Fax/Tel: (91 11) 436 3677

Philippines

Mr. Thomas G. Aquino
Governor, Board of Investments
Industry and Investments Building
385 Sen. Gil J. Puyat Avenue, Makati City, Philippines
Fax: (63 2) 759 34 22 or 895 82 33 , 895 39 93
Tel: (63 2) 897 66 82 , 895 35 18
e-mail: gov1@boi.gov.ph

Dr. Beatriz P. del Rosario
Deputy Executive Director for Research and Development
Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD)
Department of Science and Technology
Los Baños, Laguna 4030, Philippines
Fax: (6349) 5360016
Tel: (63 49) 5360014-20 (63 2) 837 1651
e-mail: bpr@ultra.pcarrrd.dost.gov.ph

Ms. Angelina M. Sta. Catalina
First Secretary
Philippine Mission to UN and Other International Organizations in Geneva
47, Avenue Blanc, 1202 Geneva
Fax: (41 22) 716 1932
Tel: (41 22) 716 1930
e-mail: philippine.mission@ties.itu.int

South Africa

Mr. Marcel Mitchelson
Department of Trade and Industry
Directorate Standards and Environment
Johannesburg, South Africa
Fax: (27 12) 320 1414
Tel: (27 12) 310 1077
e-mail: mmitchel@dti.pwv.gov.za

Ms Khungeka Njobe
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism Director : Biodiversity Management
Private Bag X 447
PRETORIA 0001
South Africa
Fax: +27-12- 320 7026
Tel : +27-12-310 3549
Email : nat_knj@ozone.pwv.gov.za

Tanzania

Mr. Lucas N. Saronga
Ministry of Industry and Commerce (MIC)
Dar-Es-Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania
Fax: (255 51) 180371
Tel: (255 51) 180075 or 255 – 811 – 608550
e-mail: mic@raha.com, attn: Lucas Saronga

Ms. Adelaide Tillya
Senior Environment Management Officer
Vice President's Office, Division of Environment
Dar-Es-Salaam, Republic of Tanzania
Fax: (255 52) 113856
Tel: (255 52) 113983 , 118416
e-mail: vpodoe@intafrica.com

Tunisia

Mr. Habib Beddiafi
Directeur
Ministry of Commerce
Tunis, Tunisia
Fax: (216 1) 795745
Tel: (216 1) 846 093
e-mail: khedija.chahloul@ati.tn

Dr. Hedia Baccar
Director at the Cabinet
Ministry of Environment and Land Use Planning
1004 Tunis, Tunisia
Fax: (216 1) 704340
Tel: (216 1) 30 29 59
e-mail: boc.meat@rdd.tn, attn: Hedia Baccar

Uganda

Mr. Nimrod Waniala
Advisor
Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry
Kampala, Uganda
Fax: (256 41) 347286
Tel: (256 41) 349521
e-mail: nim@infocom.co.ug

Mr. Telly Eugene Muramira
National Environment Management Authority
Kampala, Uganda
Fax: (256 41) 349203 / 257521
Tel: (256 41) 241064/5/8
e-mail: neic@starcom.co.ug, attn: Telly Eugene Muramira

B. Organizations

FIELD

Ms. Beatrice Chaytor
Staff Lawyer
Trade and Environment Programme
Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development
46/47 Russell Square
London WC1B 4JP
Fax: (44 171) 637 7951
Tel: (44 171) 637 7950
e-mail: bc4@soas.ac.uk

WTO

Ms. Risa Schwartz
Trade and Environment Division
World Trade Organization
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel. (41 22) 739 53 35
Fax: (41 22) 739 56 20
e-mail: risa.schwartz@wto.org

UNCTAD

Mr. Ulrich Hoffmann
Trade, Environment and Development Section
UNCTAD / DITC
Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10
Fax: (41 22) 917 0247
Tel.: (41 22) 907 5780
e-mail: ulrich.hoffmann@unctad.org

Ms. Veena Jha
Project Coordinator
UNCTAD
c/o UNDP Office in India
55, Lodi Estate, New Delhi-110003, India
Fax: (91 11) 462 7612
Tel.: (91 11) 462 8877
e-mail: veena.jha@undp.org

C. Philippine Experts

Dr. Rogelio C. Serrano
Acting Director
Forestry and Environment Division
Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD)
Department of Science and Technology
No. 5 Javier Heights, PCARRD
Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines
Fax: (6349) 536 0016
Tel.: (6349) 536 4974
e-mail: rserrano@ultra.pcarrd.dost.gov.ph

Ms. Maria Theresa San Lazaro
Principal Assistant
Department of Foreign Affairs
U.P. Diliman, Q.C., Philippines
Fax: (632) 834 1451
Tel.: (632) 834 3042

Mr. Joy D. Chaneco
Head Executive Assistant
Environmental Management Bureau
99 Kamias Rd., Q.C., Philippines
Fax: (632) 929 5698
Tel.: (632) 926 8745
e-mail: joychaneco@yahoo.com

Mr. Jorge L. Reyes
Sustainable Development Advisor
United Nations Development Programme
106 Amorsolo St., Legaspi Village, Makati City,
Philippines
Fax: (632) 816 4061
Tel.: (632) 892 7666
e-mail: jorge.reyes@undp.org

Mr. Emmanuel Yap
Executive Director, MASIPAG
3346 Aguila St., Rhoda Subd.,
Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines
Fax: (6349) 536 5549
Tel.: (6349) 536 5549, 536 6183
e-mail: eyap@laguna.net, masipag@mozcom.com

Mr. Oscar Gutierrez
FDRO IV, Bureau of Food and Drugs – Department of Health
Alabang, Muntinlupa City, Philippines
Tel.: (632) 807 8220

Ms. Lisa C. Antonio
Senior Fellow, Development Academy of the Philippines
San Miguel Avenue, Pasig, Philippines
Fax: (632) 631 2123
Tel.: (632) 631 2139
e-mail: antoniol@dap.edu.ph

Ms. Monina M. Cunanan
DMO IV, Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Q.C., Philippines
Fax: (632) 920 1761
Tel.: (632) 920 1761

Mr. Rafaelito H. Taruc
Director, Infrastructure Service-Oriented Industries Dept
Board of Investments
Industry & Investments Bldg, 385 Gil J. Puyat Ave.,
Makati City, Philippines
Fax: (632) 895 3649
Tel.: (632) 897 6682
e-mail: boisoid@mnl.sequel.net

Mr. Domingo I. Bagaporo
Division Chief, Eng'g Products Division, Eng'g Indus. Dept
Board of Investments
Industry & Investments Bldg, 385 Gil J. Puyat Ave.,
Makati City, Philippines
Fax: (632) 895 3649
Tel.: (632) 897 6682

D. Secretarial Assistance

Ms. Yazmynn Alarcon
R&D Engineer
Oriental and Motolite Corporation
Roces Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines

Fax: (6344) 711-2220
Tel: (6344) 711-2236, 711-2262, 711-2220
e-mail: omc038@pacific.net.ph, prilead2@bulacan.net.ph

Mr. Marco Carlos
Investments Specialist
Engineering Industries Department/ Environmental Unit
Board of Investments,
Department of Trade and Industry
385 Sen. Gil Puyat Avenue, Makati City, Philippines
Fax: (632) 895-3649
Tel: (632) 890-9544, 895-8214
e-mail: engproducts@boi.gov.ph, mr2@pacific.net.ph

Ms. Alma Cedillo
Science Research Specialist II,
Forestry and Environment Research and Development Division
Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD)
Department of Science and Technology
Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines
Fax: (6349) 536-0016
Tel: (6349) 536-0014 to 20; 24
(63) 0918-905-1673
e-mail: almac@ultra.pcarrd.dost.gov.ph